

# TULSA WORLD

Published Every Morning, Including Sunday,  
BY THE WORLD PUBLISHING CO.

EUGENE LORTON ..... Owner and Publisher  
F. O. LAHRSON ..... Business Manager  
P. L. STEENHOF ..... Managing Editor  
T. A. LATTA ..... Chief Editorial Writer

MEMBER OF THE AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATION

Entered in the Tulsa Post Office as Second Class Matter

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for reproduction of all news dispatches credited to it and not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news published herein.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—DAILY AND SUNDAY:

	Domestic	Foreign	
One Year	\$1.50	Three Months	\$1.20
Six Months	\$1.75	One Month	.25
DAILY ONLY	Domestic	Foreign	
One Year	\$1.00	Three Months	\$.75
Six Months	\$.75	One Month	.25
SUNDAY ONLY	Domestic	Foreign	
One Year	\$.25	One Month	.25

BY CARRIAGE IN TULSA, SAYS SPRINGER, KENDALL, AND REILY PHOK.

Per Week ..... \$1.15  
Per Month, In Advance ..... .65  
Per Year, In Advance ..... 7.50

AVERAGE NET PAID CIRCULATION FOR THE MONTH OF JULY, 1919, WAS 21,265.

J. E. Scott, Circulation Manager, do solemnly swear that the average net paid circulation of the Tulsa Morning and Sunday World for the month of July, 1919, was 21,265 to the best of my knowledge and belief.

E. E. Scott, Circulation Manager.

Subscribed and sworn before me this 1st day of August, 1919.

MADEL KEIM,  
Notary Public.

My commission expires October 17, 1921.

PHONE 6000 FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS

After 2 p.m. daily, Sundays and holidays call the following:

Editorial Department ..... 6000  
Editorial Department ..... 6001  
Subscription Department ..... 6002

Daily Biblical Quotation.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 20, 1919.

Trust in the Lord, and do good; so shall thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed.—Psa. 37:1.

If he shed his precious blood

To bring me to the fold,

Can I think that any good

He ever will withhold?

First not thyself because of evildoers, neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity.—Psa. 37:1.

A FORECAST COME TRUE.

The president in making his final drive for an acceptance of the peace treaty "without the doting of an i or crossing of a t," asserts that it is necessary in order to bring peace to America and lay the spirit of unrest. "Peace or Chaos?" says the esteemed Oklahoman in falling in with the administration's drive. "The quickest way—and possibly the only way—to get peace, and a just peace, is for the United States senate to ratify the treaty as it stands."

Here is a forecast come true. When the president was telling the senate that he "would so interweave the league of nations with the treaty that it could not be separated," many pointed out that he would, in the last extremity, rely on a demand for peace to aid him in forcing a reluctant country a measure it would never adopt of its own free will. Long ago the president ceased to debate the league. His mouthpieces, of whom the Oklahoman is one in this state, have never made pretense of meeting the objections urged against it. "Take it just as it stands," says the Oklahoman, "regardless of where it leaves us as a nation, because we want peace."

But just as there was a price too great to pay to perpetuate peace, so there is a price too great to pay to re-establish peace. On another occasion we were counseled by precisely the same individuals to sink our national pride, submit to indignities and humiliations in order to avoid war. With every national instinct outraged by the aggressions of a ruthless enemy, we were admonished to remain neutral even in our thoughts. The price was too great. We refused to pay it.

Now we are urged to make an even heavier payment in order to ostensibly re-establish peace, but as a matter of fact to vindicate the autocratic ruthlessness of a politician.

"If the senate makes reservations," says the president, "we must go to Germany on our knees and beg for acceptance." That simply is not so. And the Oklahoman, true to its role as a Wilson echo, says "Great Britain has approved the treaty as it stands." Belgium also has ratified it. Germany ratified it almost immediately. Other nations that have not yet given formal ratification are nevertheless for the treaty without amendment."

We might ask the esteemed Oklahoman for its warrant for that last statement, but it is beside the mark in any event. Neither England nor Belgium or Germany or those "other nations" are passing on the treaty from the viewpoint of the United States. They may or may not ratify without affecting the issue so far as the United States is concerned.

"If the amendments," says the Oklahoman, "proposed by the republicans should be adopted by the United States senate, it would again open up the discussion of all the conflicting claims that have been satisfactorily settled for the good of all at the peace conference."

"Satisfactorily settled" for whom? Certainly not the United States. Is not the present situation precisely what the president was advised would come? Did he not have ample assurance that the peace conference decisions were not satisfactory to the people of the United States? Assuming that the decisions were for the "good of all" other nations, will the Oklahoman state specifically that it considers them good for this nation?

The rejection of the treaty in toto need work no considerable embarrassment on America. Those nations that have accepted the treaty are at peace. The United States senate can accept it with reservations and follow with a resolution declaring the war at an end, or it can reject the entire treaty and adopt such a resolution, or it can make the reservations recognized as necessary do neither, and put it squarely up to all of the nations to accept or reject the reservations.

The attempt on the part of the administration and its defenders to evade responsibility for the delay misleads no one. Had the president remained in Washington, as he was urged to do, appointed a bipartisan committee of recognized ability and experience to oversee affairs to attend the peace conference, kept the senate

in session and himself acted as the go-between and umpire of the peace delegates on the one hand, the senate on the other, every provision of the treaty would have been acceptable to the people of America at the time it was accepted by the conference, and its final ratification by the United States would have been a matter of a few days only.

But no. He sought needs violate every precedent, defy every suggestion, and threaten every critic. He must needs set himself at the head of a delegation of mediators and earn for himself a reputation for egomism that will stand unchallenged in history. He must needs ignore and insult his constitutional coadjutors in all treaty making.

And now his hawks over the land say: "It does not seem probable that the other aggrieved nations would agree to the dispositions proposed by the republicans if presented to the republicans." Yes. But in the interest of all Americans and dictated by every country-loving citizen regardless of party. Whether the "constitutional nationalists" agree or not is a matter that should influence the outcome and even the president not at all. The one question to consider at this time is whether or not this thing named for America? Under their watch they accept it.

## WHO STARTED PROFITEERING?

The Barometer of Public Opinion is a department that World readers may come into with their views and opinions. They are invited to avow themselves of the privilege liberally. The only requirement being that the communications be not too long, and be signed by the writer. These communications are always interesting, and often instructive. So, for instance, that of Mr. B. Jankowsky which appears in that department today.

In replying to a former contributor who wrote concerning the high cost of living, Mr. Jankowsky makes this remarkable statement:

"In fact, in the earlier situation, our government was the first to start profiteering. On the first two million pairs of shoes the government placed an order for at the outbreak of the war, according to the Shoe and Leather Gazette. It paid \$4.85 per pair for shoes every retailer was getting for \$1.75 and \$2.00, that were quoted for spring and summer. The government had to pay twice the price of the manufacturers, and those prices for rations delivery to any committee who are or may be investigating high prices."

I also fail to see why the gentile leather dealer did not have all leather shoes offered for \$1.50 or \$1.80 instead of having canvas shoes at \$1.50. I fully agree with the gentleman that goods are higher than they ought to be, but why names the retailer?

There is not a retailer in the

## BAROMETER OF PUBLIC OPINION

**Government Was First Profiteer**  
Editor, World. My argument has been called to an article that appeared last Wednesday, July 14, signed by F. L. Rankin, in which the gentleman complains of the high cost of living and mentions my story as one in which he was told that some leather is going up every day, and that he was informed that we worked this shoe precisely because we took this term as perhaps the old prices before the war broke out.

In my opinion if our representatives at Washington will not make speeches to get votes for the next presidential election and go after about 10 big interests who control the raw material as well as the labor force, we will not have the old prices again.

We have on the number of letters from clothing manufacturers who instead of delivering their goods in July or August, have delayed until the first of September, and in most cases are getting the advance because the retailer is at these prices.

I don't know where the gentile leather dealer got his information, but I do know that we had an order for 2 million pairs of leather shoes at \$1.50 and \$2.00 that were quoted for spring and summer. The government had to pay twice the price of the manufacturer.

For further information of Mr. Rankin as well as others who single out Tulsa for everything that is bad,

I have letters from my brother who is at present in New York trying to induce some manufacturers to desist our fall orders in which he tells

the prices that are being asked for by the government in the market conditions.

So, I have letters from the Shoe and Leather Gazette, in which he informs me that shirts that we retail at \$1.50 to \$2.00 are \$4.85 per pair for shoes every retailer was getting for \$1.75 per pair and selling for \$2.00 and that price was paid by the government in spring or immediate delivery.

Hoping this will find space in the

Barometer of public opinion as well as

the other manufacturers in the state.

Very truly yours,

J. B. JANKOWSKY.

For the Palace Clothiers.

letter, I was beginning to look forward to Leonard Brooke's visit with a longing which should have warned me, but which did not give me an uneasy moment. Perhaps I was too young, too unsophisticated, to realize the importance of such a meeting for another than my husband. Perhaps I was too happy to think that that there was still room for improvement, but which I could not afford to lose.

I had deliberately lied. As I realized it, I grew cold and then hot. Half Clifford expected a letter, and was that the cause of his coming home? Did I know he was going away? Then came the knowledge that I could at least know whether she was conversant with my husband's intentions. And I felt my mouth tighten as I remembered the letter upstairs. The letter I had not opened, but which I should read.

I could scarcely wait while he packed his bag, and he was hardly out of the house before the letter again was in my hand. Yet even now I turned it over several times before I slowly drew it from its covering.

I read myself for it, but I

I must! I whispered.

"Dear Cliff," she commenced.

"I am so sorry I can't see you tomorrow. I have had word from brother Jack that mother is ill and am leaving at once for her home. I shall think of you every day, and hope you will not entirely forget me."

"I am sorry," I said.

"Perhaps most people would have thought the letter did not amount to much; that it was simply a friendly note. Maybe that was all it was. Yet that Edna Gardner had an engagement to see Clifford was evident. And he had been to keep that engagement I was positive, and that explained his asking for his mail. He had expected a letter from her. I at once thought again of sealing the letter and passing it to him. Then came the realization of the lie I had told. The postmark on the envelope said when it was delivered as plainly as if it spoke. No, I couldn't give it to him. I must destroy it.

It was dreadfully unhappy all the time Clifford was gone in the first place because of what I had done, and then because of what is G's note had implied of intimacy with my husband. Had it not been for Leonard Brooke, I don't know how I should have gotten through those days.

He brought me some new songs which we tried together, and each afternoon when he was at leisure he called for Edith and me, then for Clifford, and we rode for an hour or two. He drove more carefully even than usual.

"I gave Mrs. Hammond one

square to tell her to tell Muriel, "I don't want to give her another. Shall refuse to go out with me. I'm afraid."

"Don't think that for a minute!" rejoined I. "Enjoy it too much to give it up for a little bolt."

Then, too, Leonard's delight in

my society, his appreciation of me, smoothed my wounded pride and made me almost forget—at times—my action in destroying Clifford's

that they must sin to be merry and bright."

A late Literary Digest gives two pages to the Methodist Centenary exposition and states that someone suggests that had the flight fans on their way to Toledo stopped off at Columbus, they would have seen a better show than the Willard Dempsey prizefight. It covered 114 acres and occupied 8 immense buildings. The exhibits gave glimpses of all the methods of world travel, the earth and history, customs and industries were displayed and illustrated by natives converted and sent over by foreign missionaries. "The Warfarer" said to be the greatest religious pageant ever given in America was enacted before an audience of 8,000 every night for three weeks. The same means were resorted to in drawing the public to this unusual religious fair as those used for world expositions—and it all announced that henceforth the church would fight for its own with new weapons.

Protestantism has reformed and will attempt to show that flowers grow along the straight and narrow path and that the devil has no option on all the good times.

Color, beauty, music, and the dramatic instinct are to be given back to the church. It is no longer to be the dull, flat institution of the past.

We hope the moral of the incident will not be lost on Mr. Fenton. The law is just the law. It is properly viewed, no respecter of persons. It cannot stop to enquire whether the violator is rich or poor, great or small, organized or unorganized. Nor can it be deterred, by a show of voting strength. That man who practices a conduct within the provisions of the law has nothing to fear. No combination of men can become so powerful that they, individually or as an organization, can violate the law with impunity.

"If the senate makes reservations," says the president, "we must go to Germany on our knees and beg for acceptance." That simply is not so. And the Oklahoman, true to its role as a Wilson echo, says "Great Britain has approved the treaty as it stands." Belgium also has ratified it. Germany ratified it almost immediately. Other nations that have not yet given formal ratification are nevertheless for the treaty without amendment."

We might ask the esteemed Oklahoman for its warrant for that last statement, but it is beside the mark in any event. Neither England nor Belgium or Germany or those "other nations" are passing on the treaty from the viewpoint of the United States. They may or may not ratify without affecting the issue so far as the United States is concerned.

"If the amendments," says the Oklahoman, "proposed by the republicans should be adopted by the United States senate, it would again open up the discussion of all the conflicting claims that have been satisfactorily settled for the good of all at the peace conference."

"Satisfactorily settled" for whom? Certainly not the United States. Is not the present situation precisely what the president was advised would come? Did he not have ample assurance that the peace conference decisions were not satisfactory to the people of the United States? Assuming that the decisions were for the "good of all" other nations, will the Oklahoman state specifically that it considers them good for this nation?

This was in what might be called "our day" but what think you of the faith of our Puritan fathers who had forbidding countenances but only on Sundays but throughout the week, compelled it to sin? They had no scruples of conscience, and memorized many chapters of scripture to keep her from the church. She had Sundays and she hated this thin-skinned religion. It was only under different circumstances and in after years that she found that happiness might be got from it.

This was in what might be called "our day" but what think you of the faith of our Puritan fathers who had forbidding countenances but only on Sundays but throughout the week, compelled it to sin? They had no scruples of conscience, and memorized many chapters of scripture to keep her from the church. She had Sundays and she hated this thin-skinned religion. It was only under different circumstances and in after years that she found that happiness might be got from it.

This was in what might be called "our day" but what think you of the faith of our Puritan fathers who had forbidding countenances but only on Sundays but throughout the week, compelled it to sin? They had no scruples of conscience, and memorized many chapters of scripture to keep her from the church. She had Sundays and she hated this thin-skinned religion. It was only under different circumstances and in after years that she found that happiness might be got from it.

This was in what might be called "our day" but what think you of the faith of our Puritan fathers who had forbidding countenances but only on Sundays but throughout the week, compelled it to sin? They had no scruples of conscience, and memorized many chapters of scripture to keep her from the church. She had Sundays and she hated this thin-skinned religion. It was only under different circumstances and in after years that she found that happiness might be got from it.

This was in what might be called "our day" but what think you of the faith of our Puritan fathers who had forbidding countenances but only on Sundays but throughout the week, compelled it to sin? They had no scruples of conscience, and memorized many chapters of scripture to keep her from the church. She had Sundays and she hated this thin-skinned religion. It was only under different circumstances and in after years that she found that happiness might be got from it.

This was in what might be called "our day" but what think you of the faith of our